3 In view of the decision of the Government of India at (a) & (b) above, the seniority of Sri G. B. Shinde, whose date of continuous officiation in the equated cadre is dated 27th January 1950 has to be refixed as Sl.No. 81 A (i.e.,) immediately below Sri D.V. Narayana Rao at Sl. No. 81 to be and immedaitely above Sri V.N. Raichur Sl.No. 82, after deleting his name at Sl.No. 128.

4 It is accordingly proposed to refix the Seniority of S/Shri S.G. Gokhale, G. K. Hegde N. T. Kavathekar, R. V. Bentur and G. B. Shinde. Objections to this proposal if any, may be submitted in *Six Sets* addressed to the Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Personnel, Cabinet Secretariat, North Block, New Delhi through the Commissioner for Commercil Taxes in Mysore, Bangalore, within one Month from the date of publication of this Notification in the *Mysore Gazette*.

By Order and in the Name of the Governor of Mysore,

B. P. PATIL,

Deputy Secretary to Government,
General Administration Department,
27 *(Integration).*

Notification dated 1st August 1972.

No. GAD 47 INS 72. The final Inter State Seniority List of the Non-Gazetted Officers of Publicity and Information Department has been published in accordance with the decisions of the Government of India in Part III-I of the *Mysore Gazette* dated 1st December 1966 under Notification No. GAD 181 INS 66 dated 2nd November 1966. In that list the name of Sri K. N. Bengeri has been ranked at Sl. No. 2 in Category V-Ministerial. Aggrieved by the equation of post and ranking Sri K. N. Bengeri filed a Writ Petition No. 1987/67 in the Mysore High Court. The High Court disposed of the Writ Petition on 8th June 1972. The High Court Judgment is annexed.

Representations from all those who are likely to be affected by the final decisions of the Government of India that may be taken with regard to the equation of the post held by Sri K. N. Bengeri as also his rank, may be submitted in six sets addressed to the Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Personnel, Cabinet Secretariat, North Block, New Delhi,-1, through the Director of Information and Tourism in Mysore, Bangalore *within one month* from the date of publication of this Notification in the *Mysore Gazette*.

By Order and in the Name of the Governor of Mysore

B. P. PATIL,

26 *Dy. Secy. to Govt. Genl. Admn. Dept.*
(Integration).

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MYSORE AT BANGALORE.

Dated the 8th Day of June 1972.

PRESENT.

The Hon'ble MR. A. Narayana Pai, Chief Justice.

AND

The Hon'ble MR. Justice S. R. Range Gowda writ Petition No. 1987 of 67.

Krishnarao Narayanarao Bengeri, OOD. Asst. Secretary, Boundary Consultative Committee, Bangalore-1. Govt. of Mysore, Vidhana Soudha.

Petitioner.

(By Sri K. S. Savanur).

Vs.

1 The Union of India by its Home Secretary, New Delhi.

2 The State of Mysore by its Chief Secretary, Vidhana Soudha, Bangalore.

3 D. Narayana Rao, 283, 7th Block Jayanagar Bangalore.

4 C. V. Iype, Assistant Director of Publicity, Information Department, Vidhana Soudha, Bangalore.

... *Respondents.*

(By Sri B. Ramachandra Rao, for Respt-1,
By Sri D. B. Mandappa, High Court Government, pleader for Respt.—2, others not present).

Writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India with an affidavit praying that in the circumstances stated therein this Court may be pleased to quash the orders of Respondent No. 2 in No. GAD 181 INS 66 dated 2nd November 1966 published in *Mysore Gazette* dated 1st December 1966 etc.

This writ Petition coming on for hearing this day, Chief Justice, made the following:—

ORDER

The petitioner, who is a Stenographer allotted from the erstwhile State of Bombay to new State of Mysore complains against the rejection of his representation to equate his post with that of the Chief Reporter in the Department of Publicity and Information.

2 As the equations have been maintained without difference in both the provisional and final ISS list and the petitioner placed in Category V, whereas the Chief Reporter had been placed in the higher category No. IV and the petitioner had also full opportunity to make representations and in fact did so, the only point for consideration is whether has been a clear application of the four principles governing the formaulation of equations in the manner discussed in the Judgment of this Court in Dharmaraj V. Union of Indis, 1970 (2) Mysore Law Journal 184.